arXiv:1502.00875v4 [hep-ph] 8 Jun 2015

The hidden symmetries in the PMNS matrix and the light sterile neutrino(s)

Hong-Wei Ke[1]*, Jia-Hui Zhou[1], Shuai Chen[1], Tan Liu[1] and Xue-Qian Li[2]†
[1] *School of Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China*
[2] *School of Physics, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China*

The approximately symmetric form of the PMNS matrix suggests that there could exist a hidden symmetry which makes the PMNS matrix different from the CKM matrix for quarks. In literature, all the proposed fully symmetric textures exhibit an explicit $\mu-\tau$ symmetry in addition to other symmetries which may be different for various textures. Observing obvious deviations of the practical PMNS matrix elements from those in the symmetric textures, there must be a mechanism to distort the symmetry. It might be due to existence of light sterile neutrinos. As an example we study the case of the Tribimaximal texture and propose that its apparent symmetry disappears due to existence of a sterile neutrino.

PACS numbers: 14.60.Pq, 14.60.Lm, 14.60.St

Numerous experiments which are carried out in past several decades make the behaviors of neutrinos understandable. As is commonly accepted, mixing among different flavors of leptons are due to the mismatch between the mass eigenstates and flavor eigenstates, it is the same as the quark case, but different in structures. To bring the weak interaction eigenstates (flavor) to the physical ones (mass), the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakawaga-Sakata (PMNS) matrix[1, 2] should be introduced. If there are only three active neutrinos the mixing matrix is written as

$$V=\begin{pmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} & V_{13}\\ V_{21} & V_{22} & V_{23}\\ V_{31} & V_{32} & V_{33}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{1}$$

Generally there are four independent parameters, namely three mixing angles and one CP-phase. There are various schemes to parameterize the matrix in literature. For example, the Chau-Keung(CK) parametrization [3] is

$$V=\begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}\\ -c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta}-s_{12}c_{23} & -s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta}+c_{12}c_{23} & s_{23}c_{13}\\ -c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta}+s_{12}s_{23} & -s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta}-c_{12}s_{23} & c_{23}c_{13}\end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

where s_{jk} and c_{jk} denote $\sin\theta_{jk}$ and $\cos\theta_{jk}$ with $j,k=1,2,3$.

The measured values of the PMNS matrix exhibit an approximately symmetric form which may hint that the practical matrix originates from a high symmetry, but is distorted by some mechanisms. Indeed, one of the physics achievements of the 20th century convinces us that symmetry and symmetry breaking compose the main picture of the nature, so one may reasonably expect that an underlying symmetry determines the mixing matrix of leptons which later is distorted somehow. Lam has shown this possibility in terms of the group theory[4] where the CKM and PMNS matrices are separately resulted via different routes to break the large symmetry. In Lam's scheme, the resultant PMNS still possesses an obvious symmetry with θ_{13} strictly being zero, therefore to reach the practical PMNS a further symmetry breaking is needed. It is natural to ask if one can provide a reasonable mechanism to explain the distortion.

Meanwhile some phenomenological symmetries are observed, such as the quark-lepton complementarity and self-complementarity[5–11], $\mu-\tau$ symmetry[15]. But all those symmetries are only approximate, so it also implies that there should be some mechanisms to result in their deviations from exact symmetric forms.

The high-precision measurements [16–19] determines $\theta_{12}\approx 34^\circ$ and $\theta_{23}\approx 45^\circ$ and a small, but non-zero θ_{13}. The values could be traced to a mixing pattern with high symmetries i.e. for example the tribimaximal (TB) mixing pattern[12–15] which is one of the possible symmetric textures

$$V_{TB}=\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0\\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

which means that $\theta_{12}=35.26^\circ$, $\theta_{23}=45^\circ$ and $\theta_{13}=0^\circ$ in the adopted parametrization. In this scenario the $\mu-\tau$ symmetry holds and in the mass eigenstate ν_2, ν_e, ν_μ and ν_τ have the same probability.

However the measurements of the accelerator and reactor neutrino oscillation experiments[20–24] determine $\theta_{12}=(33.65^{+1.11}_{-1.00})^\circ$, $\theta_{23}=(38.41^{+1.40}_{-1.21})^\circ$ and $\theta_{13}=(8.93^{+0.46}_{-0.48})^\circ$. It is noted that the values are set based on the scenario for three generations of neutrinos. Apparently the TB mixing patterns decline from the data. One may ask whether the symmetries in the TB mixing patterns should be abandoned? Even though it is too early to make a definite conclusion yet, there exists a possibility that those symmetries still hold, whereas the matrix might be distorted from the symmetric form by new physics.

Recently, the anomalies of short-baseline neutrino experiments[25–27] hint that there may exist light sterile neutrinos which mix with the active ones. Moreover Schechter and Valle [28, 29] also discussed the (n,m) model which suggested importance of getting sterile neutrino involved. If this picture indeed works, the existence of sterile neutrinos would play a role to make the mixing matrix being in the superficial form where the original symmetries are just hidden somehow or slightly broken. In our earlier work

---

*khw020056@hotmail.com
†lixq@nankai.edu.cn

[30], we proposed that the quark-lepton complementarity and self-complementarity[5–11] still hold and involvement of the sterile neutrino(s) distorts them to be approximate. Along the same line, one may ask if the symmetries in the TB mixing patterns are distorted by existence of sterile neutrinos. In other words, when PMNS is extended to a $n \times n$ matrix, the symmetries in TB mixing patterns are exact or just slightly broken, but in the left-upper 3×3 block of the generalized PMNS matrix which corresponds to the experimentally observed values, the symmetries are no longer exhibited at all. In an explicit statement, the symmetries which are shown in the original 3×3 texture, still hold or slightly broken, but as mixing between the sterile and active neutrinos exists, the apparent symmetric form is lost.

In this letter we use this picture to study the neutrino mixing matrix i.e. supposing that the symmetries in the tribimaximal (TB) mixing patterns are exact or nearly exact, but a mixing among active neutrinos and sterile neutrinos causes the difference between the TB mixing matrix and data.

Here, we only consider the simplest scheme where three active neutrinos plus one sterile neutrino are involved, namely the (3+1) scheme and show that it indeed works.

As a (or a few) light sterile neutrino joins the game, the neutrino mass matrix would turn into a 4×4 form. If charged-lepton mass matrix is still diagonal [31], a real neutrino mass matrix which may possess certain symmetries and manifest in special textures as suggested by some authors, is written as

$$V_{4\times4} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C & D \\ B & E & F & G \\ C & F & H & I \\ D & G & I & J \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

can be diagonalized by a 4×4 PMNS-like unitary matrix[32, 33]

$$V_{4\times4} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13} & 0 \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13} & c_{13}s_{23} & 0 \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & c_{23}c_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\alpha & 0 & 0 & \sin\alpha \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\sin\alpha & 0 & 0 & \cos\alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\beta & 0 & \sin\beta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\sin\beta & 0 & \cos\beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\gamma & \sin\gamma \\ 0 & 0 & -\sin\gamma & \cos\gamma \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

For convenience of later discussions we still set $\theta_{13} = 0°$ and keep θ_{12} and θ_{23} in the expression. In the expression the first matrix is the original PMNS matrix and the successive three matrices correspond to the mixing of the sterile neutrino with the three active flavors respectively. For this case one can find $|V_{13}| = |s_\gamma(c_\beta s_\alpha c_{12} + s_\beta s_{12})|$. We first constrain ourselves to the simplest setting $\alpha = \beta = \gamma$. By the same procedures as done in Ref.[30] we fix $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 18.001°$ and now the 4×4 matrix reads

$$|V_{4\times4}| = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0.776531} & \mathbf{0.471115} & \mathbf{0.12969} & 0.397912 \\ \mathbf{0.388265} & \mathbf{0.588078} & \mathbf{0.654438} & 0.274091 \\ \mathbf{0.388265} & \mathbf{0.588078} & \mathbf{0.690553} & 0.162945 \\ 0.309031 & 0.293904 & 0.279518 & 0.860226 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

Comparing with the experimentally determined 3×3 PMNS matrix V_{PMNS} Ref.[5]

$$|V_{PMNS}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.822^{+0.010}_{-0.011} & 0.547^{+0.016}_{-0.015} & 0.155^{+0.008}_{-0.008} \\ 0.451^{+0.014}_{-0.014} & 0.648^{+0.012}_{-0.014} & 0.614^{+0.019}_{-0.017} \\ 0.347^{+0.016}_{-0.014} & 0.529^{+0.015}_{-0.014} & 0.774^{+0.013}_{-0.015} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

the left-upper 3×3 block of the $V_{4\times4}$ matrix is nearly consistent with that form and $|V_{13}|$ is no longer zero. By fitting data, we only fit matrix elements V_{11}, V_{12}, V_{13}, V_{23} and V_{33} which are free of CP phase. Because so far the CP phase has not been experimentally determined and no even any hint is available, we cannot expect to extract information on δ from data. In our previous work, by the χ^2 analysis, we find that the CP phase δ is within a region close to zero, but all of the theoretical predictions are waiting for probes of future more precise experiments. Therefore in this work, the derived mixing matrix is real.

The obtained matrix elements are close to the data, but still not fully satisfactory yet. If slightly breaking the $\mu - \tau$ symmetry, the situation would be further improved. Concretely, we introduce a small variation ϵ to θ_{23}, i.e. let the original θ_{23} slightly deviate from 45°. Obviously, ϵ should be determined by fitting data. Thus, one further fix the values as $\theta_{23} = 39.3999°$ and $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 17.777°$,

$$|V_{4\times4}| = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0.777551} & \mathbf{0.473604} & \mathbf{0.126298} & 0.393906 \\ \mathbf{0.424789} & \mathbf{0.642425} & \mathbf{0.585201} & 0.25374 \\ \mathbf{0.348925} & \mathbf{0.527692} & \mathbf{0.751624} & 0.186692 \\ 0.305319 & 0.29074 & 0.276858 & 0.863481 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

It is noted that using the mechanism of involving a sterile neutrino and a slight $\mu-\tau$ symmetry breaking, the data can be well explained. The scheme is equivalent to refitting the data with two independent parameters instead of one as done above. It is noted that in this scheme the transformation matrix remains unitary. It is also natural to expect that the symmetry breaking degree could be at order of $O(\frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau})$, concretely, as we refit the data to obtain ϵ, it is $\epsilon \sim (\sin 45° - \sin 39.3999°)/\sin 45° \approx 2(m_\mu/m_\tau)$, which indeed is at the expected order.

In fact as the $\mu - \tau$ symmetry is lifted, the constraint $\alpha = \beta = \gamma$ is no longer valid and one will obtain a new $|V_{4\times4}|$

$$|V_{4\times4}| = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0.792861} & \mathbf{0.501251} & \mathbf{0.134394} & 0.319482 \\ \mathbf{0.431412} & \mathbf{0.633394} & \mathbf{0.561101} & 0.312829 \\ \mathbf{0.357905} & \mathbf{0.525473} & \mathbf{0.732239} & 0.244147 \\ 0.239079 & 0.267277 & 0.36186 & 0.860501 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

in the new setting, we have $\theta_{23} = 39.680°$, $\alpha = 13.823°, \beta = 15.977°$, and $\gamma = 22.808°$.

Alternatively one may choose another scheme, that he keeps $\theta_{23} = 45°$, $\theta_{13} = 0°$ and lets the original θ_{12} slightly deviate from 35.26°. In that scheme, the best fitting values are $\alpha = 5.126°, \beta = 27.748°, \gamma = 23.220°$ and $\theta_{12} = 37.370°$. Namely, the value of α is smaller than that obtained in other cases whereas β and γ are larger. The corresponding $|V_{4\times4}|$ matrix is

$$|V_{4\times4}| = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0.791554} & \mathbf{0.504097} & \mathbf{0.136193} & 0.31746 \\ \mathbf{0.427469} & \mathbf{0.51519} & \mathbf{0.560057} & 0.488043 \\ \mathbf{0.427469} & \mathbf{0.51519} & \mathbf{0.739606} & 0.0695213 \\ 0.0893532 & 0.463729 & 0.347522 & 0.810062 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

where the matrix elements V_{21} and V_{22} are still equal to V_{31} and V_{32} respectively.

In Ref.[34], the reactor antineutrino anomaly is studied where $|\Delta m_{41}|^2 > 1.5\text{eV}^2$ and $\sin^2(2\theta_{14}) = 0.14 \pm 0.08$ are obtained, the resultant mixing element $\sin^2(2\theta_{14})$ is a bit lower than our estimation $0.22 \sim 0.34$. Our prediction on $V_{e4}^2 = 0.102 \sim 0.155$ is also $3 \sim 5$ times larger than $0.024 \sim 0.033$[35] determined by the data of short-baseline neutrino oscillation, but consistent with the number of 0.15[36] obtained by the data of Gallium radioactive source experiments and 0.13[36] gained by fitting the data of the measurement on $\nu_e + {}^{12}C \rightarrow {}^{12} N_{g.s.} + e^-$. In Ref.[36] the authors indicate that the large V_{e4}^2 in the Neutrinoless $\beta\beta$-decay is favored to guarantee a low value of $|\Delta m_{41}^2|$ which are required by the cosmological constraints [37, 38].

It is noted that the mixing angles between the active neutrinos and sterile neutrino are relatively large, so that in the resultant upper-left 3×3 block in Eq.(6), Eq.(8), Eq.(9) or Eq.(10) the unitarity is violated to some extent. Generally, introducing a sterile neutrino which mixes with the active ones, the new 4×4 matrix is unitary and the upper 3×3 sub-matrix is no longer unitary. But the data seem to favor an almost unitary 3×3 matrix which corresponds to the direct measurements. Comparing the results given in Refs.[39, 40] where the authors studied the violation of the unitarity of the neutrino mixing matrix, our results manifest a larger violation beyond the constrains set in [39]. Since the errors of concerned experiments which measure properties of neutrinos are still large, our results, so far, do not drastically conflict with data, i.e. are still tolerable. However, if the future experiments further confirm the constraints with higher accuracy, our scheme that one can distort the tribimaximal mixing pattern by introducing just one sterile neutrino should be abandoned. In fact, there are lots of alternations to remedy the scheme, for example, one may invoke a complex 3 (active neutrinos)+n (sterile neutrinos) mixing scheme and/or choose other symmetrical PMNS textures, the mixing angles between active neutrinos sterile neutrinos could be very different, namely violation of unitarity of the 3×3 matrix may be alleviated and meanwhile the data can still be realized.

As a brief conclusion, in this work we do not intend to make a complete analysis based on the group theory as done by many authors[41–43], instead we have carried out a phenomenological study. Recently, many authors suggest that existence of light sterile neutrinos may lead to solutions for some phenomenological problems where the theoretical predictions deviate from experimental data. As indicated in the introduction, the practical PMNS matrix is obviously distorted from the symmetrical form, therefore it is natural to conjecture if introducing a sterile neutrino can make up the gap between the proposed symmetric texture and the practical data.

Here as an example we discuss the case of the TB mixing patterns. First, as only one light sterile neutrino is included, the matrix V_{TB} is extended to a $V_{4\times4}$. The mixing angles between the sterile neutrino with the active ones in the 4×4 extended PMNS matrix V_{PMNS} are fixed by fitting data. The results show that the element V_{13} is non-zero and close to the newly measured value. Meanwhile the unitarity of the 3×3 is violated to an uncomfortable degree, but not too much beyond the tolerable range yet. It is noted that in this work, we take the tribimaxial texture as the subject, and employ the simplest 3+1 model to carry out the computation. We expect the future experiments to verify or negate the simplest scheme, and then we may turn to invoke more complicated cases, namely, if a more complicated scheme and/or another symmetrical PMNS texture (not the TB) are taken the results might be closer to the real data and the unitarity of the 3×3 matrix should be approximately retained.

Acknowledgement

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) under the contract No. 11375128 and 11135009.

[1] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 984 (1968) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **53**, 1717 (1967)].

[2] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962).

[3] L. L. Chau and W. Y. Keung, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1802 (1984).

[4] C. S. Lam, arXiv:1105.4622 [hep-ph]; C. S. Lam, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 113002 (2011) [arXiv:1104.0055 [hep-ph]].

[5] Y. Zhang, X. Zhang and B. -Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 093019 (2012) [arXiv:1211.3198 [hep-ph]].

[6] H. Minakata and A. Y. .Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 073009 (2004) [hep-ph/0405088].

[7] M. Raidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 161801 (2004) [hep-ph/0404046].

[8] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio and L. Merlo, JHEP **0905**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0903.1940 [hep-ph]]; G. Altarelli and D. Meloni, J. Phys. G **36**, 085005 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0620 [hep-ph]]; R. de Adelhart Toorop, F. Bazzocchi and L. Merlo, JHEP **1008**, 001 (2010) [arXiv:1003.4502 [hep-ph]]; G. Altarelli, F. Fer-

uglio, L. Merlo and E. Stamou, JHEP **1208**, 021 (2012) [arXiv:1205.4670 [hep-ph]].

[9] Y. -j. Zheng and B. -Q. Ma, Eur. Phys. J. Plus **127**, 7 (2012) [arXiv:1106.4040 [hep-ph]]; X. Zhang and B. -Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 093002 (2012) [arXiv:1206.0519 [hep-ph]]; H. Qu and B. -Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 037301 (2013) [arXiv:1305.4916 [hep-ph]].

[10] X. Zhang, Y. -j. Zheng and B. -Q. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 097301 (2012) [arXiv:1203.1563 [hep-ph]].

[11] N. Haba, K. Kaneta and R. Takahashi, Europhys. Lett. **101**, 11001 (2013) [arXiv:1209.1522 [hep-ph]].

[12] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **458**, 79 (1999) [hep-ph/9904297]; P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **530**, 167 (2002) [hep-ph/0202074].

[13] Z. z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **533**, 85 (2002) [hep-ph/0204049].

[14] H. Fritzsch and Z. Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **372**, 265 (1996) [hep-ph/9509389]; H. Fritzsch and Z. z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **440**, 313 (1998) [hep-ph/9808272]; H. Fritzsch and Z. z. Xing, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 1 (2000) [hep-ph/9912358].

[15] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 958 (1978).

[16] K. Eguchi *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003) [hep-ex/0212021].

[17] S. N. Ahmed *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 181301 (2004) [nucl-ex/0309004].

[18] M. H. Ahn *et al.* [K2K Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 041801 (2003) [hep-ex/0212007].

[19] C. K. Jung, C. McGrew, T. Kajita and T. Mann, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **51**, 451 (2001).

[20] K. Abe *et al.* [T2K Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 041801 (2011) [arXiv:1106.2822 [hep-ex]].

[21] P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 181802 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0015 [hep-ex]].

[22] Y. Abe *et al.* [DOUBLE-CHOOZ Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012) [arXiv:1112.6353 [hep-ex]].

[23] F. P. An *et al.* [DAYA-BAY Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012) [arXiv:1203.1669 [hep-ex]].

[24] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [RENO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012) [arXiv:1204.0626 [hep-ex]].

[25] M. Sorel, J. M. Conrad and M. Shaevitz, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 073004 (2004) [hep-ph/0305255].

[26] M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 093005 (2007) [arXiv:0705.0107 [hep-ph]].

[27] G. Karagiorgi, Z. Djurcic, J. M. Conrad, M. H. Shaevitz and M. Sorel, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 073001 (2009) [Erratum-ibid. D **81**, 039902 (2010)] [arXiv:0906.1997 [hep-ph]].

[28] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980).

[29] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 774 (1982).

[30] H. W. Ke, T. Liu and X. Q. Li, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 053009 (2014) [arXiv:1408.1315 [hep-ph]].

[31] J. Y. Liu and S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 9, 093010 (2013) [arXiv:1304.2334 [hep-ph]].

[32] I. Girardi, D. Meloni, T. Ohlsson, H. Zhang and S. Zhou, arXiv:1405.6540 [hep-ph].

[33] L. S. Kisslinger, arXiv:1309.4983 [hep-ph].

[34] G. Mention, M. Fechner, T. .Lasserre, T. .A. Mueller, D. Lhuillier, M. Cribier and A. Letourneau, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 073006 (2011) [arXiv:1101.2755 [hep-ex]].

[35] C. Giunti, M. Laveder, Y. F. Li and H. W. Long, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 073008 (2013) [arXiv:1308.5288 [hep-ph]].

[36] C. Giunti and M. Laveder, Phys. Lett. B **706**, 200 (2011) [arXiv:1111.1069 [hep-ph]].

[37] J. Hamann, S. Hannestad, G. G. Raffelt, I. Tamborra and Y. Y. Y. Wong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 181301 (2010) [arXiv:1006.5276 [hep-ph]].

[38] E. Giusarma, M. Corsi, M. Archidiacono, R. de Putter, A. Melchiorri, O. Mena and S. Pandolfi, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 115023 (2011) [arXiv:1102.4774 [astro-ph.CO]].

[39] S. Antusch and O. Fischer, JHEP **1410**, 94 (2014) [arXiv:1407.6607 [hep-ph]].

[40] F. J. Escrihuela, D. V. Forero, O. G. Miranda, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, arXiv:1503.08879 [hep-ph].

[41] K. S. Babu, E. Ma and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. B **552**, 207 (2003) [hep-ph/0206292].

[42] D. V. Forero, S. Morisi, J. C. Rom?o and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **88**, no. 1, 016003 (2013) [arXiv:1305.6774 [hep-ph]].

[43] S. Morisi and J. W. F. Valle, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 466 (2013) [arXiv:1206.6678 [hep-ph]].